

Date: Wed, 10 Nov 93 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #433
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 10 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 433

Today's Topics:

 Dealing with Internet Jammers
 GAY & QST
 new groups

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 9 Nov 93 01:30:51 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: Dealing with Internet Jammers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Geez. I finally got my hands on a news reader that supports
'kill' files and all of the sudden reading rec.radio.amateur.policy
got a whole lot easier. Same goes for r.r.a.misc.

Bob Witte / HP PMO (Colo Springs) / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY / (719) 590-3230

Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1993 03:47:52 GMT
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!murdoch!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!jeg7e@uunet.uu.net
Subject: GAY & QST
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9ewNcc3w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
Robert <robert@amanda.jpunix.com> wrote:

```
>jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:
>
>> In article <034311Z28101993@anon.penet.fi>, Tina <an4797@anon.penet.fi> wrote
>> >
>> >I was going to post in my own name, but with the attitudes floating around
>> >here, I decided to use an anonymous machine.
>>
>> Too bad. Are you closeted?
>
>Perhaps Tina's corseted.
>
>-----
>|  A Codeless Technician is a life form with two legs and no brain.  |
>-----
```

I'm convinced that Robert thinks there is a joke or two in here, unfortunately it's lost on me.

--

Any opinions expressed herein are not intended to be construed as those of UVA

```
-----
\ \ /   Jon Gefaell,  Computer Systems Engineer   | Amateur Radio - KD4CQY
 \\/   Systems Research, ITC OSSSD/Carruthers Hall | -Will chmod for food-
  \/   The University of Virginia, Charlottesville | Hacker@Virginia.EDU
-----
```

Date: 9 Nov 93 03:03:57 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!sol.ccs.deakin.edu.au!news.cs.uow.edu.au!news.ci.com.au!eram!
dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: new groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2574@arrl.org>,
ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

```
| rec.radio.amateur.love.arrl
| rec.radio.amateur.hate.arrl
| rec.radio.amateur.arrl.who?
|
| 73 from ARRL HQ, Ed
```

Nice work, Ed! It's nice to see someone taking the mickey out of their own organisation; some people take life far too seriously.

Whilst the organisation is perceived to be "stuffy", they've got some great people working for them!

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC PGP 2.3
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munnar!esi.COM.AU!dave available

Date: 10 Nov 93 00:28:37 GMT
From: headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@rutgers.rutgers.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2bn079\$3l4@apple.com>, <2boeud\$i3l@news.acns.nwu.edu>,
<CG8tC1.6sq@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>
Subject : Bambi Meets Godzilla, or rec.radio.amateur.policy.on.the.air

jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>>>I'm game. SSB or RTTY? :-) :-)
>> I'm game. CW or RTTY? :-) :-)
>Hey let's do it! 20 meters anyone?

Sure. How about 14.313 MHz?

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: 10 Nov 93 00:38:34 GMT
From: headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@rutgers.rutgers.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2bnebgINNhqv@nbc.ksu.ksu.edu>,
<1993Nov9.190512.26802@Csl!Stanford.EDU>, <2bp59jINNt8q@nbc.ksu.ksu.edu>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

cbr600@nbc.ksu.ksu.edu (Jeremy L. Utley) writes:

[...]

>Enough Said.

Flame Bait.

PS - 6 and 2 SSB are quite active in the Midwest during the summer months.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1993 12:28:59 GMT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!gclarkii@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CFzI04.IFA@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <CG6p8z.5AC@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<CG733s.4CK@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a career (was: 3rd party Flame for Robert)

Jeff,

What I meant by this was you said that you do not class plugging in IC's as homebrewing. So what is the difference from x-sistors and IC's?? I've done work with both types of silicon, so whats the big deal? Are saying that the only GOOD equipment is that which is made from old TV's??? Try to build a 440 or up X-vector from one, I do not belive it would work to well. I use some CW gear on UHF/up becuase it's cheaper and no other reason.

Gary

--
Gary Clark II | FreeBSD 1.0 being run everywhere!
gclarkii@radon.gbdata.com |
gclarkii@netport.neosoft.com |
Mail info@radon.gbdata.com for information on FreeBSD support

Date: 10 Nov 93 00:54:26 GMT
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!perry@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov8.221333.16226@CslIi.Stanford.EDU>,
<CG8IGz.IEz@walter.bellcore.com>, <CG8uIp.7M7@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>
Subject : Re: New licensing structure needed?

(sohl,william h) writes:

>
>In fact, I'd favor keeping the 13wpm and 20wpm tests IF and only IF
>they were required to obtain additional HF CW segments. As it is now,
>as an Advanced class license holder I see no rational as to why I need
>to pass a 20wpm CW test to gain access to the last few Khertz of
>the US HF phone band segments. Having said that, I am not at all
>opposed to retaining a 20wpm requirement for the current CW portion

>of the HF segments as currently authorized for Extra class licenses.

The only rational reason for a CW test that I see is in its use as a "hands-on" test. If we institute other paths to Extra, I think they need to include equivalent hands-on testing.

Someone suggested a typing test for those that want to use packet or any of the digital modes; I could go along with that. For example, tune a station calling CQ and send a message that was just passed to you on a piece of paper. Choose various typing speeds corresponding in difficulty to the current 5/13/20 levels and look for one minute solid transmission or 7 out of 10 key phrases correct.

It would sure help some of the stuff I've seen on 80m.

Perry
AA0ET

Date: 10 Nov 93 00:24:14 GMT
From: headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@rutgers.rutgers.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ZBLNcc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
<1993Nov9.011209.22804@Csli.Stanford.EDU>,
<rcrw90-091193103100@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a career (was: 3rd

rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

>Elements 1A, 1B or 1C must be passed separately. Getting 100% on the other
>elements and a failing grade on the CW causes failure of the whole test (or
>at least prevents getting a ham license of the appropriate grade.)

So, failing the written elements, which contain the other mode questions, also fails you. Moreover, you need only get 7% correct on the Extra CW exam to pass, while that written (containing all those other modes I don't wanna learn about...humph!) requires a grade TEN TIMES better.

>Please cite some specific examples if I am wrong here.

There are a number of examples cited in Learning the Morse Code, which is published by the ARRL.

>A derivative of coherent FSK techniques used for automated digital
>transmission. Generally far inferior as I read the published papers on the

>subject.

(Aside: is that "I've read the papers on coherent FSK" or "I've read the papers on coherent CW"? Since CW is not an FSK system, clearly coherent CW is not a derivative.)

Depends on what you mean by "inferior". Sure, you can code the heck out of a low rate bitstream, but then you require an XMP in your basement to run the Vterbi decoder. Coherent CW requires a fairly stable phased locked oscillator pair, which, aside from being quite a bit cheaper, won't replace your furnace.

>I have never built a QRP CW rig, I built a 150 watt CW transmitter in 1961
>which is the last CW only transmitter I built. I have since been involved
>in numerous club projects and individual efforts to build 2M FM gear or
>something similar.

Sounds like the only HF project you've ever done was for CW. Which demonstrates my point.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
>paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Mon, 8 Nov 93 18:32:28 EST
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <DRT.93Nov7231513@bolognese.mit.edu>,
<931108.11937.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <2bmeas\$bh4@senator-bedfellow.MIT.EDU>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

"CW cuts congestion by shrinking bandwidth..."

ONLY if people use it. The people you want to force to learn CW won't be using it.

Date: 10 Nov 93 03:48:17 GMT
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2boeud\$i3l@news.acns.nwu.edu>, <CG8tC1.6sq@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>,
<1993Nov10.002837.10694@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: Bambi Meets Godzilla, or rec.radio.amateur.policy.on.the.air

That "Jake Grafton" quote is quite interesting...it sounds like a reference to Top Gun, which of course was a LONG way in the future at the time in which FLIGHT OF THE INTRUDER was set.

Date: 10 Nov 93 03:14:28 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov4.180629.17316@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<931105.76983.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <1993Nov8.221333.16226@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

In article <1993Nov8.221333.16226@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Ed Eilers <EDELLERS@delphi.com> writes:

>

>>Shouldn't law also be based on RATIONAL expectations? Why should ONE mode be
>>a barrier to entry to the use of other modes?

>

>Sounds like a good "no-written-test" argument; after all, why should I have
>to learn about (insert-wideband-mode) when all I want to do is work CW?

Well of course you're right that you shouldn't need to learn encodings for other modes you aren't going to use, and in fact there is nothing in the current exams concerning the details of information encoding in any mode other than CW. There's no English grammar or pronunciation test for example for phone operation, nor any test of your ability to focus a camera for ATV.

However, that doesn't mean there should be *no* written test. All amateurs need to know the regulations and enough electrical theory to keep themselves within the regulations regardless of the modes they will be operating.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

Date: 10 Nov 93 03:31:16 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931105.76983.EDELLERS@delphi.com>>,
<DRT.93Nov6104808@bologna.mit.edu>, <1993Nov8.222054.16478@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements

In article <1993Nov8.222054.16478@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

>

>>I've got it! How about a no-code HF license allowing you to use any
>>mode EXCEPT Voice and Image? People can use that ever-so-high-tech
>>digital stuff! Just pass through 4A.

>

>It's been suggested. Band usage and bandwidth would be limited by license
>class. The lowest class would have a cap of 500 Hz and access to the upper
>half of the narrowband segments on most HF bands (20 is an obvious exclusion).
>Next class gets full bandwidth (about 5 kHz) on about 3/4 of the wide / narrow
>segments on all the bands, and the highest class gets everything.

>

>This seems to please most folks.

Yes, that's certainly an acceptable approach *provided* that manual Morse speed *testing* isn't the criteria for the different classes. Any scheme that ties access to other modes to Morse speed testing is unacceptable to me since the ability to do high speed Morse is irrelevant to operation of other modes.

However, I don't think this is an ideal approach. A flat licensing scheme is the preferred course IMHO. The purpose of licensing is to ensure that the licensee is aware of and competent to obey the FCC regulations applicable to his modes of operation. This plan also makes no provision for the newer wideband techniques of band sharing, IE SS. This would only serve to lock amateurs into the narrow mindset they've held since amateur radio began. That conflicts with the basis and purpose of the amateur radio service.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

Date: 9 Nov 93 18:54:12 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!nbc.ksu.ksu.edu!

news@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov9.190512.26802@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<2bp59jINNt8q@nbc.ksu.ksu.edu>, <1993Nov10.003834.11147@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

In article <1993Nov10.003834.11147@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>cbr600@nbc.ksu.ksu.edu (Jeremy L. Utley) writes:

>

>[...]

>

>>Enough Said.

>

>Flame Bait.

>

>PS - 6 and 2 SSB are quite active in the Midwest during the summer months.

>

Kinda Weird, then, because I have monitored the SSB frequencys very often, and
have never heard *ONE* amateur radio operator on them...or at least on the 2m
SSB frequencys. And as far as 6M goes, you can't get on 6M SSB without a 1000
dollar xmtr.

73's DE

```
-----  
|      | \  |      .----/      \  /      / \      | Jeremy Utley | | | |
|      | \  |      |  /|      \  /      /--\     | 1400 Univ. DR. |  
|      | \  |      | /|      |  /      /--\     | Manhattan, KS |  
|      | \  |      '-/--'      |  /      /--\     | 66502 |  
-----
```

Internet:cbr600@matt.ksu.ksu.edu Bitnet:cbr600@ksuvm Packet:NOYAX@N00ER.KS.USA

-----STANDARD DISCLAIMERS APPLY-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #433
